cans that they are against independence, they will as quickly whisper in the ear of a nationalist leader that they are ardent patriots ever desirous of sacrificing their all for their beloved country.

My personal observation is that in the years 1934 and 1935, when the Filipinos have independence within their grasp, they are not nearly so anxious for it as when it was denied them. It was all very well to orate about American oppression. It was all very fine to have a perennial campaign issue of immediate and complete independence. It was all very convenient to be afforded an opportunity to go on long trips at government expense to the United States and Europe. The actual grant of independence has for the first time brought home to the masses of the people a sobering sense of the responsibilities which must be assumed and of the sacrifices which must be made. Many Filipinos, if now afforded a graceful exit from a too successful liberty campaign, would gladly pass through the door, content to live peacefully and humbly under the slight and generous American control. But it is too late.

NATIONALIST LEADERS

It was previously remarked that six or seven men charted the Philippine policy of the United States. A similar observation holds good for Philippine nationalism. In addition, by coincidence or otherwise, it is worthy of note that leaders of Philippine thought appeared on the scene by pairs. Marcelo H. del Pilar and Jose Rizal, Andres Bonifacio and Emilio Aguinaldo, Sergio Osmefia and Manuel L. Quezon, to these six, modern Philippine nationalism owes

more than to all the others who helped in obtaining Philippine liberty.

As powerful personalities ever will, the Filipino leaders had their differences and misunderstandings. Del Pilar and Rizal, members of a brilliant group of youthful Filipinos, worked together in Europe for the common Philippine good